	ed States Patent	AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22. www.uspto.gov	OR PATENTS
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,561	10/31/2003	Thomas Grafenauer	03100134US	8413
	7590 09/19/2007 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLAND	CLARKE PLACE	EDWARDS, NEWTON O		
RESTON, VA 2	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	
			f	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

.

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

	Application No.	No. Applicant(s)				
	10/697,561	GRAFENAUER, THOMAS				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	N Edwards	1774				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILI Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b Any reply received by the Office later than three months after th earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUN CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a tion. y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y statute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>11 June 2007.</u>					
	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for a	allowance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice u						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the appli	cation					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>6-13,17 and 18</u>		ration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	_					
6) Claim(s) <u>1-3,19-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Ex	ominor					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner				
Applicant may not request that any objection						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
		S 440(a) (d) an (b)				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of:	oreign phonty under 35 0.5.C.	s 119(a)-(d) of (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority doc	uments have been received					
2. Certified copies of the priority doc		Application No.				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the						
application from the International I		Treceived in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for		t received				
Attachmont/o)						
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)						
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	5) 🛄 Notice of 6) 🗌 Other:	Informal Patent Application				
S. Patent and Trademark Office		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

PTOL-326	(Rev.	08-0	6)

1. Applicant's arguments filed 6/1//07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant urges on one hand that 1) Applicant respresentative does not posses English Langue translations of the 1449 document but submits that the relevance of these documents is apparent from the figures and drawings.

Interesting statement. Your request to have the lined reference considered in the IDS is denied since most of the lined references do not have drawings and the references with drawings art not in English. Once again, regarding the returned IDS of 1/13/06, the lined references were not considered since applicant failed to comply with 37 CFR rule 1.98 by not providing a statement of relevance for each foreign reference not in English. Thus the issue is moot.

Applicant concludes that 2) " at least one paper free layer ..." of claim 21 is support by the spec at page 3 lines 12-13 (the paper is eliminated) and page 4, lines 7-8(the absent of paper layer).

Claim 21 states "at least one paper free layer of transparent ..resin", which means the other layers in the wood fiberboard can have paper. But according to applicant, your spec stated supra there is **no paper is present** in the wood fiberboard. Thus, The New Matter rejection is maintained.

Applicant urges that 3) Eisermann does teach claim 1 recites a support board made of HDF MDF or chipboard wherein a decoration is printed on topside of the support board.

Where are you looking in Eisermann to come to the above conclusion? Col.3 line 21 of Eiserman states apply decorative layer to the top of the support plate 5. Col.4 line 18-20 of Eisermann state the support plate is made from HDF, MDF, particle board (chip board) etc. The forgoing is shown in Fig 1 and in claims 9,8, and 6 for example.

Applicant concludes 4) it is clear that the support plate 5 does not have a decorative printed on its top surface.

Really, even when claim 8 states the decorative layer is applied to the top of the supporting plate 5 by printing (claim 9).

Applicant urges that in fact 5) the melamine layer (transplant layer) 9b is disposed between the topside of the support plate 5 and the decorative layer 4. Applicant has failed to provide any citation in the reference to support him interesting conclusions. Fig 1 shown the transparent layer 2 (melamine layer free of paper layer as in claim 21) over the decorative layer 4 printed on the top of the support plate 5. See above and claim 8.

Applicant urges that 6) only support plate 5 is made of MDF however, the support plate

5 does not have a decoration printed onto its topside.

See above answers to a argument 3,4, and 5 for a response. Since the arguments for

claim 21 is the same as claim 1 supra no further response is deemed necessary.

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to for failing to provide support for the of invention as is now claimed.

The specification as filed fails to support 1) Claim 21, Line 4 "at least one paper free

layer...".

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for the reason(s) given in

the objection above.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as being clearly anticipated by Eiserman (US 6,568,148) alone or optionally taken with Vogel (US 7,171,998) or Maes (5,882,569) for reasons of record and above.

4. Claims 4, 5, and 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

The cited patent discloses the state of the prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Primary

Examiner Edwards at telephone number 571-272-1521

N Edwards

N Edwards ' Primary Examiner Art Unit 1774

,